

# A SOLVABILITY CRITERION FOR NAVIER-STOKES EQUATIONS IN HIGH DIMENSIONS

T. M. VISWANATHAN AND G. M. VISWANATHAN

ABSTRACT. We define the Ladyzhenskaya-Lions exponent  $\alpha_L(n) = (2+n)/4$  for Navier-Stokes equations with dissipation  $-(-\Delta)^\alpha$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , for all  $n \geq 2$ . We review the proof of strong global solvability when  $\alpha \geq \alpha_L(n)$ , given smooth initial data. If the corresponding Euler equations for  $n > 2$  were to allow uncontrolled growth of the enstrophy  $\frac{1}{2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2$ , then no globally controlled coercive quantity is currently known to exist that can regularize solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations for  $\alpha < \alpha_L(n)$ . The energy is critical under scale transformations only for  $\alpha = \alpha_L(n)$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Navier-Stokes equation for the velocity  $u$  of an incompressible fluid with viscous dissipation  $-(-\Delta)^\alpha$  is given by

$$(1) \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla p = -(-\Delta)^\alpha u,$$

where  $u$  is a time-dependent divergence-free vector field in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with zero mean. The pressure  $p$  can be eliminated using Leray projections, since it merely serves to ensure the divergence free condition (see Equation (20) below). Given the initial condition

$$(2) \quad u(x, 0) = u_0(x)$$

where  $u_0(x) \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , the question is whether or not solutions remain smooth.

Olga Ladyzhenskaya [8, 9], in the 1960s, proved global regularity for the two dimensional ( $n = 2$ ) parabolic ( $\alpha = 1$ ) case. For  $n = 3$  the challenge is to improve on the well known exponent  $\alpha \geq 5/4$  obtained long ago by Jacques-Louis Lions [10, 11], still the best known result to date [5, 6, 7, 15]. One decade ago, Mattingly and Sinai [7] gave an elementary proof of this result and showed that there are no blow-ups and solutions remain smooth if  $\alpha \geq 5/4$ . Later Katz and Pavlović [6] extended the result by proving additional statements, concerning the Hausdorff dimension of the singular set at the time of first blow-up. Recently, in the context of theoretical physics, we have studied [15] the problem in higher dimensions, in order to gain a better understanding of non-Newtonian turbulence and non-local anomalous diffusion of energy density in the Fourier domain in hyper-dissipative incompressible flows.

We draw the reader's attention to how the lowest value of the exponent  $\alpha$  known to ensure global regularity increases by  $1/4 = 5/4 - 1$ , as the number of dimensions increases from  $n = 2$  to  $n = 3$ . The question that we address is whether or not this  $1/4$  increase per dimension is a more general principle with deeper significance.

Thus motivated, we define the Ladyzhenskaya-Lions exponent

$$(3) \quad \alpha_L(n) = \frac{2+n}{4}, \quad \forall n \geq 2,$$

by linear extrapolation from  $n = 2$  and  $n = 3$ . We then show how to generalize to all  $n$  the seminal regularity results of Ladyzhenskaya and Lions, starting with the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.1.** *If  $\alpha > \alpha_L(n)$  then one has strong global solvability for the system (1), (2) in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .*

In fact, we give two different proofs of this theorem. Although it may have gone somewhat unnoticed, Lions himself arrived at the result 40 years ago [11] (see also the paper by Guermond and Prudhomme [5]). Our own physical argument [15] used  $L^1$  estimates in the Fourier domain to bound the rate of growth of maximal norms of the velocity  $u$  and its spatial derivatives. Since then, we have been able to generalize to arbitrary  $n$  an elegant proof of Katz and Pavlović [6] for the case  $n = 3$ , based on  $L^2$  estimates. We present first the latter proof, because it uses standard methods of functional analysis. We then present the second proof, by reformulating in mathematical terms the physical arguments given in ref. [15]. This second proof is longer, but which nevertheless sheds further insight on how and why the cascades of energy (and vorticity) continue to bedevil attempts to prove or disprove global regularity for the important and well known special case  $\alpha = 1$  and  $n = 3$ . For higher dimensions  $n > 3$  the nonlinearity can lead to even more violent cascade of energy, such that it becomes progressively harder to bound the uncontrolled growth of the enstrophy, defined as  $\frac{1}{2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2 = -\frac{1}{2}\langle u, \Delta u \rangle$ .

The two methods of proof, though equivalent, shed light on different aspects of the problem and complement one another. Taken together, they seem to suggest that in higher dimensions  $n \geq 3$  the Ladyzhenskaya-Lions exponent represents a genuine critical point [15]. Both methods rely ultimately (explicitly or implicitly) on conservation of energy to regularize the solutions. Solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations on a time interval  $[0, T]$  satisfy

$$\|u(\cdot, T)\|_{L^2}^2 = \|u_0\|_{L^2}^2 - \int_0^T \langle (-\Delta)^\alpha u, u \rangle.$$

The second term on the right is called the dissipation term. The closely related Euler equations for inviscid flow do not have the dissipation term.

We first remark on notation. We will use  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  always to denote an  $L^2$  inner product in space. We follow the notation used in ref. [6] throughout this paper for the expression  $A \lesssim B$ , to mean  $A \leq CB$  where  $C$  is some constant. This constant may depend on  $T$ , the norms of the initial values, and on an  $\epsilon$  which we keep fixed throughout this paper.

**Acknowledgements.** We thank CNPq (Process 201809/2007-9) for funding. We thank Jean-Luc Guermond, H. D. Jennings and V. Milman for helpful information. We also thank V. M. Kenkre and the Consortium of the Americas for Interdisciplinary Science for their hospitality.

## 2. PROOF BASED ON $L^2$ ESTIMATES

The following is a generalization to  $\mathbb{R}^n$  of the known proof for  $n = 3$ . We briefly sketch the outline of the argument. By taking suitable inner products, one can

bound the rate of growth of  $L^p$  Sobolev norms of  $u$ . Then, by invoking a carefully chosen Sobolev inequality, one can re-express these bounds in terms of  $L^2$  norms, at which point the rest of the proof proceeds conventionally and one recovers global solvability.

The dependence on  $n$  enters the final result solely through the Sobolev inequality. Most importantly, the dependence on  $n$  of  $\alpha_i(n)$  offers a new and different perspective on the well known explanation of why the parabolic Navier-Stokes equations have global regularity in two but not in three space dimensions. Due to the close relationship between the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations, the literature does not always make clear the significant differences between them in two dimensions. One explanation argues that for  $n = 2$  vorticity is conserved, whereas for  $n = 3$  vorticity and hence enstrophy can grow. This argument actually misses the point for the Navier-Stokes case, since in two dimensions the Euler equation itself has smooth solutions, rendering dissipation irrelevant. Plausible explanations have their basis on energy considerations. For  $n = 2$  the direct energy cascade — if it counterfactually (i.e., hypothetically) existed in the Euler case — would remain weak enough that dissipation with  $\alpha = 1$  can control it. But for  $n > 2$  the energy can cascade more violently, such that dissipation with  $\alpha = 1$  cannot necessarily control it.

In this context, the following proof provides a clear interpretation, viz. that Sobolev embedding becomes more “costly” for larger  $n$ . By costly, we mean that the number of derivatives necessary for the embedding increases with  $n$ . Here, energy enters the picture (via the norm  $\|u\|_{L^2}^2$ ), and the role of  $n$  becomes clear.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Let  $H^\beta$  and  $W^{\beta,p}$  denote the  $L^2$  and  $L^p$  Sobolev spaces, respectively, over  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with  $\beta$  derivatives. Taking the inner product by pairing Equation (1) with  $u$ , we get

$$(4) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 = - \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq - \|u\|_{H^\alpha}^2 + \|u\|_{L^2}^2$$

Hence, if the solution  $u$  remains smooth up to time  $T$ , we have the estimate

$$(5) \quad \int_0^T \|u\|_{H^\alpha}^2 dt \lesssim (1 + T).$$

We next pair Equation (1) with  $(-\Delta)^\beta u$  in order to estimate  $\frac{\partial(\|u\|_{H^\beta}^2)}{\partial t}$ . We obtain

$$(6) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u\|_{L^2}^2 + \langle u \cdot \nabla u, (-\Delta)^\beta u \rangle = - \|(-\Delta)^{\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}} u\|_{L^2}^2.$$

We next estimate the nonlinear term

$$(7) \quad \langle u \cdot \nabla u, (-\Delta)^\beta u \rangle = \langle (-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} (u \cdot \nabla u), (-\Delta)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} u \rangle.$$

Recall that  $u$  is divergence free. We can bound the absolute value of the left hand side of Equation (7) by

$$(8) \quad \|u \cdot \nabla u\|_{H^\beta} \|u\|_{H^\beta},$$

using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Next, we can apply the following well known generalization [1] of Hölder’s inequality:

$$\|f_1 f_2\|_{L^p} \leq \|f_1\|_{L^{p_1}} \|f_2\|_{L^{p_2}}, \quad \frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}.$$

So we can now bound (8) by

$$(9) \quad \|u\|_{W^{0,p}} \|u\|_{W^{\beta+1,q}} \|u\|_{H^\beta},$$

or equivalently, following ref [6], by

$$(10) \quad \|u\|_{W^{1,p}} \|u\|_{W^{\beta,q}} \|u\|_{H^\beta} ,$$

with

$$(11) \quad \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} .$$

Now comes the crucial step, where  $n$  enters the picture. We twice invoke the Sobolev embedding theorem to obtain,

$$(12) \quad \|u\|_{W^{0,p}} \|u\|_{W^{\beta+1,q}} \|u\|_{H^\beta} \lesssim \|u\|_{H^\alpha} \|u\|_{H^{\alpha+\beta}} \|u\|_{H^\beta} ,$$

where, using (11), the embedding is seen to be completely continuous provided that

$$(13) \quad 2\alpha - 1 > n/2 .$$

The embedding “costs”  $n/2$  derivatives whereas we can “spend”  $2\alpha - 1$  derivatives. Remarkably, this is the only step of the argument involving  $n$ . We note that the same bound is obtained by using (10) instead of (9) in (12).

The rest of the argument proceeds straightforwardly. From Cauchy-Schwarz, we get,

$$\|u\|_{H^\alpha} \|u\|_{H^{\alpha+\beta}} \|u\|_{H^\beta} \leq \delta \|u\|_{H^{\alpha+\beta}}^2 + \frac{1}{\delta} \|u\|_{H^\alpha}^2 \|u\|_{H^\beta}^2 .$$

Combining this with Equation (6), we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|u\|_{H^\beta}^2 \lesssim \|u\|_{H^\alpha}^2 \|u\|_{H^\beta}^2 + \|u\|_{L^2}^2 .$$

Together with (5) and invoking Gronwall’s inequality gives global solvability. The sole sufficient condition (13) can be rewritten as,

$$(14) \quad \alpha > \frac{2+n}{4} .$$

□

### 3. PROOF BASED ON $L^1$ (OR $L^\infty$ ) ESTIMATES

We next give a second proof corresponding to the original argument presented in our earlier study, ref. [15]. The latter argument has its basis on the analogy or connection [15] between the Navier-Stokes equation and nonlocal Fokker-Planck equations for describing anomalous diffusion of ensembles of random walkers, such as found in Lévy flights [12]. Fourier transforming the Euler equation converts the nonlinear term into a non-local one. Taking an inner product of the Fourier transformed equation with the Fourier transform of  $u$ , one obtains an equation which conserves energy, in a manner analogous to how Fokker-Planck equations conserve probability. A well known fact about fractional or nonlocal Fokker-Planck equations from the study of Lévy flights concerns the relationship between fat tails in the probability density function and smoothness of the characteristic functions: the characteristic function may not be smooth for fat tailed probability density functions having diverging moments. Dissipation in the Navier-Stokes equations, of course, makes kinetic energy decay and adds an element of exponential damping to the Fourier transformed equation. We can use this damping to control and bound the growth of suitable norms. For convenience we chose to study the  $L^1$  norms involving the Fourier transform of  $u$ . The bounds then allow us to obtain

$L^\infty$  estimates for  $u$  and its derivatives. Hence, we actually work in the classical Hölder space rather than in Sobolev space.

We first briefly sketch the outline of the proof. We take the Fourier transform of the Navier-Stokes equation and then bound the rate of growth of the Fourier transform  $\tilde{u}(k, \cdot)$  of  $u(x, \cdot)$ , where  $k$  is the Fourier conjugate of  $x$ . Using this inequality, we then bound the “moments” of the absolute value of  $\tilde{u}$ . These “moments” are defined in a manner analogously to statistical moments of probability density functions. Conservation of energy plays an explicit and important role in the argument, because it leads to estimates of lower order derivatives of  $u$  in terms of higher order derivatives, which leads to the final result.

One aspect of the problem which becomes more clear in this argument concerns the crucial role played by scale invariance. We will show in the concluding remarks that the critical value  $\alpha_c(n) = (2 + n)/4$  for the marginal case corresponds to the scenario where the dissipation effects and the nonlinear effects (or nonlocal effects in the Fourier domain) have the same scaling. The number of dimensions  $n$  enters the picture in the step involving conservation of energy. This longer proof provides additional and complementary insight into how and why conservation of energy has different effects for different  $n$ . (In fact, both the divergence-free condition of incompressibility and conservation of energy become less relevant as  $n$  tends to infinity.)

In what follows  $u_i$  denotes the Cartesian component  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  of  $u$  and  $|k|$  is the length of the  $n$ -dimensional vector  $k$ .

**Proposition 3.1.** *The Fourier transform  $\tilde{u}_i(k, \cdot)$  of  $u_i(x, \cdot)$  satisfies*

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \| |k|^m \tilde{u}_i \|_{L^1} &\leq \sum_j^n \sum_\ell^m \binom{m}{\ell} \| |k|^\ell \tilde{u}_j \|_{L^1} \| |k|^{m-\ell+1} \tilde{u}_i \|_{L^1} \\ &\quad - \| |k|^{2\alpha+m}, \tilde{u}_i \|_{L^1} + C_{i,m}(t) . \end{aligned}$$

for any integer  $m \geq 0$ , where  $C_{i,m}$  depend only on pressure  $p$ .

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* Fourier transforming Equation (1) to eliminate the space derivatives, we obtain

$$(16) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \tilde{u}_i(k, t) + \sum_j^d \tilde{u}_j(k, t) * (\mathbf{i} k_j \tilde{u}_i(k, t)) = -|k|^{2\alpha} \tilde{u}_i(k, t) - \mathbf{i} k_i \tilde{p}(k, t)$$

with the nonlinear term becoming a nonlocal convolution term in Fourier space. Here  $\mathbf{i} = \sqrt{-1}$ , whereas  $i$  denotes a component index. We now note that for any complex function  $g(t)$ , if  $dg/dt = A(t) - B(t)g(t)$  and  $B \geq 0$  then  $\frac{d}{dt}|g| \leq |A| - B|g|$ . Identifying  $g$  with  $\tilde{u}_i$  and  $B$  with  $|k|^{2\alpha}$ , we get from Equation (16),

$$(17) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} |\tilde{u}_i(k, t)| \leq \left| \sum_j \tilde{u}_j(k, t) * (\mathbf{i} k_j \tilde{u}_i(k, t)) \right| - |k|^{2\alpha} |\tilde{u}_i(k, t)| + |k_i \tilde{p}(k, t)|$$

Multiplying by  $|k|^m$  ( $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) and integrating out  $k$  over the entire Fourier domain  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , we get,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} dk |k|^m |\tilde{u}_i(k, t)| &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} dk |k|^m \sum_j^n \left| \tilde{u}_j(k, t) * (k_j \tilde{u}_i(k, t)) \right| \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} dk |k|^{2\alpha+m} |\tilde{u}_i(k, t)| \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} dk |k|^m (|k_i \tilde{p}(k, t)|) . \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \| |k|^m \tilde{u}_i \|_{L^1} &\leq \sum_j \int dk' \| |k + k'|^m \tilde{u}_j \|_{L^1} |k'_j \tilde{u}_i(k', t)| \\ &\quad - \| |k|^{2\alpha+m} \tilde{v}_i \|_{L^1} + C_{i,m}(t) \\ &\leq \sum_j \int dk' \sum_{\ell}^m \binom{m}{\ell} \left[ \right. \\ &\quad \left. \| |k|^\ell \tilde{v}_j \|_{L^1} |k'|^{m-\ell} |k'_j \tilde{u}_i(k', t)| \right] \\ &\quad - \| |k|^{2\alpha+m} \tilde{v}_i \|_{L^1} + C_{i,m}(t) \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_{i,m}(t) = \| |k|^{m+1} \tilde{p} \|_{L^1}$ . The final integration leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \| |k|^m \tilde{u}_i \|_{L^1} &\leq \sum_j^n \sum_{\ell}^m \binom{m}{\ell} \| |k|^\ell \tilde{u}_j \|_{L^1} \| |k|^{m-\ell+1} \tilde{u}_i \|_{L^1} \\ &\quad - \| |k|^{2\alpha+m} \tilde{u}_i \|_{L^1} + C_{i,m}(t) . \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

□

The pressure satisfies an elliptic Poisson equation, which we can invert to obtain,

$$p = -\Delta^{-1} \text{Tr} (\nabla u)^2 . \quad (20)$$

It corresponds to the purely non-divergence-free component of the nonlinearity. Henceforth, we ignore  $C_{i,m}$  since pressure plays no relevant role, as discussed earlier in the context of Leray projections.

Proposition 3.1 allows us to control the growth of certain norms. To prove the existence of smooth solutions, we need the term with  $2\alpha$  in the exponent to dominate over the sums of product term (i.e., the inertial or nonlinear term). If this condition is satisfied, then the norms remain bounded. We next develop a few useful lemmas, which we prove for completeness.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $\tilde{f}$  denote the Fourier transform of a function  $f : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ . If*

$$f \in C^m, \text{ then } \left\| |k|^\ell \tilde{f} \right\|_{L^1} \lesssim \left\| |k|^m \tilde{f} \right\|_{L^1}^{\frac{\ell+n/2}{m+n/2}} \text{ for } \ell \leq m. \quad .$$

*Proof.* Scale transformations by a factor  $\lambda$  show that the inner product

$$\langle f, f \rangle = \langle \tilde{f}(k), \tilde{f}(k) \rangle \quad (21)$$

$$= \langle \lambda^{-n/2} \tilde{f}(k/\lambda), \lambda^{-n/2} \tilde{f}(k/\lambda) \rangle , \quad (22)$$

so that  $\tilde{f}(k)$  and  $\tilde{f}_\lambda(k) \equiv \lambda^{-n/2} \tilde{f}(k/\lambda)$  have the same inner product in  $L^2 = H^0$ . Now

$$(23) \quad \left\| |k|^\ell \tilde{f}_\lambda \right\|_{L^1} = \lambda^{\ell+n/2} \left\| |k|^\ell \tilde{f} \right\|_{L^1}$$

$$(24) \quad \left\| |k|^m \tilde{f}_\lambda \right\|_{L^1} = \lambda^{m+n/2} \left\| |k|^m \tilde{f} \right\|_{L^1}$$

So for sufficiently large  $\lambda$  we get  $\left\| |k|^\ell \tilde{f}_\lambda \right\|_{L^1} < \left\| |k|^m \tilde{f}_\lambda \right\|_{L^1}$ . Moreover

$$(25) \quad \frac{\left\| |k|^\ell \tilde{f} \right\|_{L^1}^{1/(\ell+n/2)}}{\left\| |k|^m \tilde{f} \right\|_{L^1}^{1/(m+n/2)}} = \frac{\left\| |k|^\ell \tilde{f}_\lambda \right\|_{L^1}^{1/(\ell+n/2)}}{\left\| |k|^m \tilde{f}_\lambda \right\|_{L^1}^{1/(m+n/2)}}$$

from which it follows that  $\left\| |k|^\ell \tilde{f} \right\|_{L^1} < C \left\| |k|^m \tilde{f} \right\|_{L^1}^{\frac{\ell+n/2}{m+n/2}}$  for some finite  $C$ , proving the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_n)$  be a multi-index and let  $|\beta|$  denote the sum of the components, according to convention. If  $\left\| |k|^{|\beta|} \tilde{f}(k) \right\|_{L^1} < +\infty$  then  $f \in C^{|\beta|}$ .*

*Proof.*

$$(26) \quad \begin{aligned} (2\pi)^{n/2} |f^{(\beta)}(x)| &\leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\mathbf{i}k|^{|\beta|} |\tilde{f}(k)| |e^{\mathbf{i}k \cdot x}| dk, \\ (2\pi)^{n/2} \|f^{(\beta)}\|_{L^\infty} &\leq \left\| |k|^{|\beta|} \tilde{f}(k) \right\|_{L^1} \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $f$  belongs to the Sobolev space  $W^{|\beta|, \infty}$ , consequently to the classical Hölder space  $C^{|\beta|}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* We first use Lemma 3.2 to bound the norms in the inertial terms:

$$(27) \quad \left\| |k|^\ell \tilde{u}_j \right\|_{L^1} \lesssim \left\| |k|^{m+2\alpha} \tilde{u}_j \right\|_{L^1}^{\frac{\ell+n/2}{2\alpha+m+n/2}}$$

$$(28) \quad \left\| |k|^{m-\ell+1} \tilde{u}_i \right\|_{L^1} \lesssim \left\| |k|^{m+2\alpha} \tilde{u}_i \right\|_{L^1}^{\frac{m-\ell+1+n/2}{2\alpha+m+n/2}}$$

From Proposition 3.1, we retain control so long as the sum of the exponents on the right hand sides of (27) and (28) is less than unity. The condition to bound the rate of growth of the relevant  $L^1$  norms then becomes

$$(29) \quad \frac{m+1+n}{2\alpha+m+n/2} < 1$$

from which we recover the condition (14). Lemma 3.3 guarantees global solvability, completing the proof.  $\square$

## 4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Attention is traditionally given in the case  $n = 3$  to vorticity. In our proofs the key quantity of interest in the Navier-Stokes system clearly is the energy. As noted by Tao [13, 14], the energy is a significant globally controlled coercive quantity which for  $\alpha = 1$  is critical for  $n = 2$  but supercritical for  $n > 2$ . However, we note that for  $\alpha \geq \alpha_L(n)$ , the energy remains both coercive and either critical ( $\alpha = \alpha_L(n)$ ) or subcritical ( $\alpha > \alpha_L(n)$ ). We can state these ideas formally:

**Theorem 4.1.** *The kinetic energy  $\frac{1}{2}\|u(\cdot, T)\|_{L^2}^2$  is critical under scale transformations only for  $\alpha = \alpha_L(n)$ .*

*Proof.* If  $u$  is a solution, then

$$(30) \quad u_\lambda(x, t) = \frac{1}{\lambda} u\left(\frac{x}{\lambda^{\frac{1}{2\alpha-1}}}, \frac{t}{\lambda^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha-1}}}\right)$$

is also a solution [15]. The energy  $E_\lambda$  of the new solution scales to

$$(31) \quad E_\lambda = \lambda^{2 - \frac{n}{(2\alpha-1)}} E.$$

We thus see that the value  $\alpha_L(n) = (2 + n)/4$  corresponds to a critical value, for which the energy remains invariant under scale transformations, i.e.  $E_\lambda = E$ .  $\square$

*Remark 4.2.* We briefly comment on the marginal case  $\alpha = \alpha_L$ . We know from Proposition 3.1 and Equations (27) and (28) that the problem for the marginal case arises because the nonlinear and dissipation terms scale identically and thus balance each other, so that it is not immediately clear which term dominates. Any small additional consideration can tip the balance. To address this issue, we recall that

$$(32) \quad \|u(\cdot, T_2)\|_{L^2}^2 < \|u(\cdot, T_1)\|_{L^2}^2$$

for  $T_2 > T_1$ , i.e. the kinetic energy is a strictly decreasing function of time. This reduction in kinetic energy, insignificant for the non-marginal cases  $\alpha < \alpha_L(n)$ , can by itself rule out any blow-up for the marginal case, as suggested by the criticality condition in Equation (31).

We could, alternatively, describe the situation from a different perspective, viz., blow-ups are energetically forbidden for  $\alpha > \alpha_L(n)$ , but not for  $\alpha < \alpha_L(n)$ . The question is what happens exactly at the critical point. In principle, if the kinetic energy were a constant of the motion, then we would not be able to rule out the possibility that almost all the energy might become concentrated into ever smaller regions of space and at an increasingly faster rate. In this scenario, we would not be able to rule out finite time singularities. However, kinetic energy is a strictly decreasing function of time, hence in the time that it takes to concentrate the energy into a smaller region, enough energy will have dissipated to prevent the formation of singularities in finite time, because not only do dissipation and nonlinearity have the same scaling for  $\alpha = \alpha_L(n)$ , but in addition the kinetic energy decays asymptotically to zero at large times.

Finally, we comment on the hypothetical worst-case scenario where the corresponding Euler equations for inviscid flows lead to blow-ups. No globally controlled coercive critical or subcritical quantity is known to exist for  $\alpha < \alpha_L$ , therefore we are forced to consider the possibility that some initial conditions may very well lead to blow-ups in the Navier-Stokes case for  $\alpha < \alpha_L$  in this hypothetical scenario.



For  $n = 3$ , the Euler equations may allow for the uncontrolled growth of the vorticity  $\omega = \nabla \times u$  due to the vorticity stretching mechanism [4, 2, 3]. The enstrophy

$$(33) \quad \frac{1}{2} \|\omega\|_{L^2}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \langle \nabla \times u, \omega \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \langle u, \nabla \times \omega \rangle = -\frac{1}{2} \langle u, \Delta u \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2$$

can thus conceivably blow up because it also is not conserved:

$$(34) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\omega\|_{L^2}^2 = \langle \omega \cdot \nabla u, \omega \rangle .$$

If it could be shown that a blow-up is possible for the Euler equation, then there may indeed be no way to regularize this worst-case scenario with a dissipation having  $\alpha < \alpha_L(3)$ . In this context, we recall the statement of Peter Constantin [3]: “It is no exaggeration to say that the Euler equations are the very core of fluid dynamics.”

The same argument can be generalized to  $n > 3$ : if  $\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2$  blows up in the Euler case, no way is (currently) known to regularize solutions via dissipation for  $\alpha < \alpha_L(n)$ . Although the question remains open, we speculate that the  $\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2$  can blow up in solutions of the Euler equations in three and higher dimensions. This intuition leads to our final statement:

**Conjecture 4.3.** *The Ladyzhenskaya-Lions exponent  $\alpha_L(n)$  is critical in the sense that it separates two regions. Solutions of the hyper-dissipative Navier-Stokes equations in dimensions  $n \geq 3$  remain smooth for  $\alpha \geq \alpha_L(n)$ , whereas for any  $\alpha < \alpha_L(n)$ , finite time singularities of  $\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2$  are possible.*

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Y. M. Berezansky, Zinovij G. Sheftel and Georgij F. Us, Functional Analysis, Vol. 2 (Birkhuser, Berlin, 1996).
- [2] P. Constantin, Ch. Fefferman and A. Majda. Geometric constraints on potentially singular solutions for the 3D Euler equation, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **21** (1996) 559–571.
- [3] P. Constantin, On the Euler equations of incompressible fluids, Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society **44** (2007) 603–621.
- [4] J. D. Gibbon, The three-dimensional Euler equations: Where do we stand? Physica D **237** (2008) 1894–1904.
- [5] Jean-Luc Guermond and Serge Prudhomme, Mathematical analysis of a spectral hyperviscosity LES model for the simulation of turbulent flows. ESAIM: M2AN **37** (2003) 893–908. DOI: 10.1051/m2an:2003060
- [6] N. H. Katz and N. Pavlović, A Cheap Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg inequality for the Navier-Stokes equation with hyper-dissipation. Geom. Funct. Anal. **12** (2002) 355–379.
- [7] J. Mattingly and Y. Sinai, An elementary proof of the existence and uniqueness theorem for the Navier-Stokes equation. Commun. Contemp. Math. **1** (1999) 497–516.
- [8] O. Ladyzhenskaya, The Mathematical Theory of Viscous Incompressible Flows (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1969).
- [9] O. Ladyzhenskaya, Mathematical analysis of Navier-Stokes equations for incompressible liquids. Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech. **7** (1975) 249–272.
- [10] J.-L. Lions, Quelques résultats d’existence dans des équations aux dérivées partielles non linéaires. Bull. Soc. Math. France **87** (1959) 245–273.
- [11] J.-L. Lions, Quelques méthodes de résolution des problèmes aux limites non linéaires (Dunod, Paris, 1969).
- [12] G. Radons, R. Klages and I. M. Sokolov, Anomalous Transport (Wiley-VCH, Berlin, 2008).
- [13] T. Tao, A quantitative formulation of the global regularity problem for the periodic Navier-Stokes equation. Dyn. Partial Diff. Equat. **4**, 293–302 (2007).
- [14] T. Tao, Why global regularity for Navier-Stokes is hard.  
URL: <http://terrytao.wordpress.com/2007/03/18>

- [15] G. M. Viswanathan and T. M. Viswanathan, Spontaneous symmetry breaking and finite-time singularities in d-dimensional incompressible flows with fractional dissipation. EPL **84** (2008) 50006.

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE ALAGOAS, MACEIÓ-AL, CEP 57072-970, BRAZIL

CONSORTIUM OF THE AMERICAS FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO, 800 YALE BLVD. NE., ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87131, USA

*E-mail address:* viswanathan.tenkasi@gmail.com

CONSORTIUM OF THE AMERICAS FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO, 800 YALE BLVD. NE., ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87131, USA

INSTITUTO DE FÍSICA, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE ALAGOAS, MACEIÓ-AL, CEP 57072-970, BRAZIL

*E-mail address:* Gandhi.Viswanathan@pq.cnpq.br